

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

				CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/771,609	02/04/2004	George T. Bertram	D-20091-03	1063	
7590	02/08/2005	•	EXAMI	EXAMINER	
Sealed Air Corporat	tion	FOSTER, J	FOSTER, JIMMY G		
P.O. Box 464			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Duncan, SC 29334			3728	TALER NOMBER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application N	lo.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary			10/771,609		BERTRAM ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit				
			Jimmy G Fost		3728			
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communic Reply	cation appe	ears on the co	er sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress		
THE M Extensi after SI - If the po - If NO p - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC ions of time may be available under the provisions of X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of reply specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply by received by the Office later than three months after patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136 unication.) days, a reply w tutory period will vill, by statute, c	6(a). In no event, h within the statutory Il apply and will exp cause the applicatio	owever, may a reply be tim minimum of thirty (30) days ire SIX (6) MONTHS from t n to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timel the mailing date of this co (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status				•				
1)□ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on	•					
	Pa) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
	,- <u>-</u>							
Dispositio	n of Claims							
4) \(\times \) \(Claim(s) <u>6.8,9,15,20,21,23 and 24</u> is/a) Of the above claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>6.8,9,15,20,21,23 and 24</u> is/Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	e withdrawr	n from consided.	eration.				
Applicatio	n Papers				•			
10)□ TI A R	the specification is objected to by the he drawing(s) filed on is/are: applicant may not request that any objected leplacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected to	a)□ acception to the dr the correctio	pted or b)⊡ c rawing(s) be he on is required if	ld in abeyance. See the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CF	` '		
		by the Exa	armici. 140to t	ne attached Office	Action of foliar 1	0-132.		
12) A(a) 1 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority of Certified copies of the priority of Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation of the attached detailed Office actions	locuments locuments for the priority all Bureau (have been re have been re y documents (PCT Rule 17	ceived. ceived in Application have been receive .2(a)).	on No d in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)								
3) 🔯 Informa	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F Io(s)/Mail Date <u>2/4/04</u> .		5) [6) [Paper No(s)/Mail Dat Notice of Informal Pa Other:)-152)		

Art Unit: 3728

1) Claims, 6, 8, ,9, 15, 20, 21, 23 and 24 are considered to distinguish over the prior art.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with $37\ CFR\ 3.73(b)$.

Claims 6, 8, 9, 15, 20, 21, 23 and 24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4 and 11 of U.S. Patent No 6,712,201 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 4 and 11 of the patent include substantially all of the subject matter set forth in present claims 6 and 15. The patent claims call for a vented bag, a foam precursor packet in the bag, first and second compartments in the packet separated by a frangible seal, a second frangible seal between one of the compartments and the enclosed space in the bag, a first foam precursor component in the first packet compartment, a second foam precursor component in the second compartment of the packet, the foam which will result from the mixing of the components filling the interior space of the bag, peel strengths of one to twelve pounds per inch or less for the

Art Unit: 3728

frangible seals, a band of printing comprising spaced apart printed areas separated by seal lines, and the frangible seals each being formed by a band of printing along contiguous surfaces of the packet which include a pattern of spaced apart printed areas separated by a grid of spaced apart seal lines in orthogonal or non-orthogonal fashion throughout the length of the frangible seals. In addition, claim 14 calls for a band of printing comprising a pattern of printed areas which cover at least about 60% of the surface area of the band.

Regarding instant claims 8 and 9, the grid constitutes a matrix, and therefore would include, as a general condition, so many seal lines per inch. Applicants have not shown criticality with respect to the six lines per inch when compared with other line densities. It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. Accordingly, to have selected any workable range of the number of seal lines per inch, including that claimed by Applicants, would have been obvious.

Regarding instant claim 21, patent claim 14 already calls for the general condition of at least 60% coverage of the printed areas on the printing band. However, Applicant's have not shown criticality for the at least 80% coverage claimed in claim 21, as opposed to any other ranges of values. Inasmuch as where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art, it would have been obvious to have selected any workable range for the printed coverage, including that claimed by Applicants.

Application/Control Number: 10/771,609 Page 4

Art Unit: 3728

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy G Foster whose telephone number is (571) 272-4554. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:45 am

- 5:15 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Jimmy G Foster Primary Examiner Art Unit 3728

JGF 4 February 2005